



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## NOTES AND COMMENTS.

---

### HOW TO PREVENT STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS.

WHAT has been the history of the average strike? A grievance or grievances; an appeal for redress. The determination on the part of the capitalist, either justly or unjustly, not to accede to the demands. The men are "called out," loudly protesting their hard treatment and their determination to appeal to the tribunal of "public opinion." They strongly proclaim their respect for the laws and aver that no rioting or disorder will be permitted, and offer to protect the property of their employers. Protect it against what? Who is going to molest it? Other capitalists? What rank hypocrisy! Taen men hungry for employment and the rewards that employment will bring seek to avail themselves of their inalienable right to "sell their labor in the highest market." What follows? Appeals, intimidation, threats, blows, and all the wild horror and disorder of riot and bloodshed. Destruction of property follows or is imminent. The civil authorities are appealed to. The civil arm is paralyzed. Then the power of the military is invoked. The soldiers are called out. The fever is at its height. Rage is rampant. The bounds are overstepped and the deadly bullet sows death and order. The sight of dead and wounded comrades awakens reason. The strike is lost. A mad rush for reinstatement follows, and the last end is worse than the first. Is this overdrawn? It was the history at Pullman and the centres of sympathetic disturbance superinduced by that act of monumental folly on the part of "Union" workingmen.

The Brooklyn strike is a more recently written page of folly as great and results as deplorable. Admitting that the grievances of the motormen and conductors were great, did their strike accomplish aught? Had there been no workingmen willing to earn wages by taking the places of the striking employees, would the cars have been run? Who received the blows and stones of the enraged strikers? Assuredly not the capitalists; but poor, unoffending citizens, inanimate cars, and fellow-workingmen. These were the sufferers, together with the strikers themselves. The City of Churches was avoided as a plague spot, and her inhabitants cruelly wronged and distressed because of the mistaken notion that a strike could redress the wrongs, real or supposed, of a few thoughtless and brutal workingmen.

The public mind seems to be impressed with the thought that antagonism and conflict are, in some way, inseparable from the relations of employer and employed: that strikes and lock-outs are necessary incidents, where some men work for others. So imbedded is this thought that all remedies, so far suggested, accept by implication the major premise that the strike and the lock-out are natural concomitants of these relations.

A careless use of words is responsible for this impression. There is no conflict between "labor" and "capital." There can be none. Misconceptions, brought about by this careless use of words and current phrases should be eradicated. A knowledge of the meaning and correct use of words is essential to accomplish this result. The word "capital" is carelessly and wrongly used, instead of "capitalist," and the word "labor" is, with similar misuse, substituted for "laborers" or "workingmen."

In its broad sense, capital is merely accumulated surplus above the necessary expenditure for maintenance. Colloquially it is made to stand for the owner or capitalist, just as labor is used to represent the whole body of those who work for wages. Of itself capital has no power for either good or evil. Only from its use can there arise either benefit or oppression. Its use necessarily implies a user, who may be either an owner or a hirer. Where the user is also the owner, both the capital itself and the gain, if any, from its use are legitimately the property of the owner. Where the user is a hirer, only so much of the gain from its use, less the sum paid for hire, is the legitimate property of the hirer. However rudimental all this may seem, it is evident that even these primary truths have not been learned by the members of labor-unions. By them "capital" is arraigned as selfish, oppressive, and subversive of the rights of the employed. It is innocent of these charges. Capital may be used for selfish purposes. Its use may even serve as a means of oppression; and its possession may make the possessor careless of the rights of others. It is not, however, the antithesis of labor. Of itself it is helpless; unused, it is self-destructive. Accretion comes only through use. Decay and disintegration are inherent in all forms of wealth; gold, silver, and the precious stones being least affected.

The desire to accumulate wealth is a legitimate one; legitimate effort to secure it is praiseworthy. Both desire and effort are common tendencies with the poor as well as the rich. Those who will may not only desire to secure capital or wealth, but may make every honest effort to lay it aside, and when obtained it is wholly and solely the property of the possessor. No one has any right, either legal or moral, to share the accumulations of another. Yet this preposterous doctrine is urged by trade-unionists. It is claimed that as their labors contributed to the accumulations of capital, they have a right to a share of it. As well might the capitalist claim a share in every investment made by his provident workmen. This is a most dangerous heresy.

Of the total working population probably four-fifths are non-union men. Have these four-fifths no rights? If non-union men seek the employment refused by the union men, and are willing to accept the wages which these refuse, what right has the minority to attempt by intimidation and force to interfere with them? There is then a conflict! But this conflict is not between the laborer and the capitalist. No! this conflict is between about one-fifth of the working population, organized in trades-unions, and four-fifths, not so organized. The conflict is between union and non-union men. It is the non-union men of whom the strikers are in fear. These are the people to be kept from employment at every hazard. These are the antagonists.

What becomes of the fine phrase "The injury of one is the concern of all"? Is its meaning narrowed and restricted to the few who are banded together in the unions? These organizations have been posing as the representatives of those who toil; whose one common cause was the ameliora-

tion of the hard lot of the workingman. They have been fighting "capital" indeed! Who are the "scabs" and "black-legs"? Workingmen: plain non-union workingmen. These are the men who are persuaded, intimidated, even beaten into insensibility, if they dare to exercise the inalienable right of "selling their labor in the highest market."

Let us have done with misnomers. There is no conflict between workingmen and capitalists. But there are strikes and lock-outs! How shall they be prevented? An elaborate "Report of the Royal Commission on Strikes," of New South Wales, concludes with no better recommendation than "that the very first thing to be done in order to permit of the settlement of a labor dispute is to try the effect of *conciliation*." This failing, the next thing is "arbitration." But these remedies imply contention, conflict, disorder, disruption of friendly ties and disturbance of business through lock-outs on the one hand and strikes on the other. Bureaus of arbitration assume the continued use of these weapons of offence and defence. The remedies they propose are inadequate. Not being founded in reason, they always have failed, and always will fail. The day will come however, when the lock-out and strike as means of coercion or redress will be looked upon as barbarous. The assertion is ventured that even to-day if a secret ballot had to determine for or against, there would seldom or never be a strike.

It took many years for communities to realize that loss by fire, no matter how fully covered by insurance, was an absolute one. When this fact was understood, intelligent effort was at once directed toward diminishing the fire risk. Every safeguard is now adopted to minimize the liability to burn and to prevent a fire from spreading. Every lock-out and strike results, just as surely as fire, in absolute loss to the community. No matter who is victorious, the loss is absolute and irretrievable. What folly to persist in methods so wasteful, destructive, and inconclusive. But there is a remedy. Trades-unions, as now organized, are too narrow—too restrictive. The demagogue and the slugger fill the high places. The walking delegate is an autocrat, blatant, ignorant, and repulsive to American institutions. Self-respecting and educated men revolt at this tyranny, and refuse to come under its yoke. All this must be changed. The scope must be broadened through education and judicious legislation! Would there be any conflict if labor organizations included all who work for wages? Such an organization would be invincible. There could be no conflict. The capitalist, though he may sometimes be an oppressor, is not a fool. If he employed workmen he would see to it that no issue should be raised between him and such a force. In a strife, his poor capital would be helpless and as worthless as Robinson Crusoe's gold was to him when on his uninhabited island.

It may be urged that the elimination of force as a means of compelling amelioration of the laborer's condition would defeat the purposes of organization. Such a result would not follow. Let a new declaration of independence be made. Enact laws that will conserve every man's right, his inalienable right, to dispose of his labor upon terms and conditions satisfactory to himself. Sweep from the constitutions and by-laws of labor unions every vestige of restriction and brute force. Nothing has been accomplished *vi et armis* but terrorism, bloodshed, and incalculable loss. These methods must be relegated to a black and uninviting past. Make more perfect unions, extend their influence for good and include in their

membership *all who toil*. Cease this conflict with fellow-workingmen. Store up power. The money spent in strikes is wasted, gone, irretrievably lost. Conserve these funds. These accumulations are capital, and capital in use gives power. Where now is the oppressor? With a liberal and perfect organization that shall include all who work for wages, with means and skill, what cannot be done if guided by enlightened and temperate zeal? Are you dissatisfied with your lot? Use this stored up power, build factories and workshops of your own, buy shares in mines, and own the stock of railroads and trolley lines. If selfish and unwise capitalists think to take any undue advantage, do not fear them, your dollars are as potent as theirs. But abandon, now and forever, all brutal and destructive methods that have only brought distress and obloquy upon the fair fame of the American workman.

STOCKTON BATES.

---

### THE POLITICAL IMPORTANCE OF HAWAII.

THE great political importance of the Hawaiian Islands is mainly due to their unique geographical position. They are situated midway from Panama to Hong-Kong and directly on the shortest line from Puget Sound to Australia. Here the two great lines of Pacific Ocean trade intersect, and here vessels must stop for refuge and supplies.

In 1875 the United States and Hawaii concluded a treaty of reciprocity which has undoubtedly given to the Islands their present wealth, and, in connection with their geographical position, their commercial importance. Several amendments were added by the Senate relative to the use of Hawaiian harbors by the United States. In 1887 another treaty was made which agreed that in exchange for certain commercial advantages the United States should have *exclusive* right to establish a naval station in the Hawaiian Islands; and Pearl Harbor was designated. In 1889 the United States proposed an enlargement of these provisions by which both were to have superior advantages and the United States were to have *perpetual* as well as *exclusive* right to establish and fortify a naval station.

Hawaii is an American State, and is embraced in the American commercial and military systems. The United States has for many years past kept warships at Honolulu, and has exercised a friendly suzerainty over the Islands which is without parallel in the history of the world. The attitude of this Government has been that of a *de-facto* supremacy, in reality a protectorate. The treaties that have been discussed and ratified between these countries have been for the closest reciprocity and for a restriction upon the disposal of Hawaiian bays, harbors, and crown lands to other nations; and attempts have been made by both to have ratified treaties of annexation. Indeed, for the past fifty years this has been a question familiar alike to Americans and Hawaiians, and its importance increases with each new event in the Pacific and with each island seized there by European maritime powers. In 1886 Hawaii was nearer to the United States than to the territory of any other country. Now, the English possession, Johnson Island, acquired in 1891, is only 600 miles away. England has also seized and fortified Fanning and Christmas islands, forming a chain of possessions toward Australia. France and Germany have not been far behind Great Britain. Both have strongly fortified stations in the Pacific. It is a notable fact that European powers, especially England, have been strength-